

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 2, 9-12, and 19-25 are pending and under consideration. In the final Office Action of August 3, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 1, 2, 9-12, and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.
- B.) Rejected claims 1, 2, 9-12, and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by *Tracton, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378)* (“*Tracton*”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

A.) Rejection of claims 1, 2, 9-12, and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph:

Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 21, and 24 to clarify that the secondary storage is a local secondary storage on the web server. This subject matter is shown, for example, in the illustrative example of Figure 5, in which secondary storage 508 is a local storage device on web server 402.

Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 22, and 23 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, or 21 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, 21, and 23 are allowable.

Claims 2, 12, and 25 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 1, 2, 9-12, and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by *Tracton, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378)* (“*Tracton*”):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 24 each claim subject matter relating to determining to download a web page to a client responsive to receiving a request message from the client to download the web page. A client capability of the client is obtained from a source other than the client responsive to the determination. The request message is analyzed to detect a minimum client characteristic. The content of the web page is adapted to be compatible with the obtained client capability and the minimum client characteristic. The web page is downloaded with the adapted content to the client. The web server retrieves the client capability from a local secondary storage on the web server.

In an illustrative example, a web server obtains information about a client's browser settings from a database in the web server's secondary storage prior to downloading the web page to the client. The web page is adapted to be compatible with the browser settings and a detected minimum client characteristic.

This is clearly unlike *Tracton*, which fails to disclose or suggest adapting a web page to be compatible with an obtained client capability and a minimum client characteristic, which is detected in a request message from a client. Further, as acknowledged by the Examiner, *Tracton* fails to disclose a web server that retrieves a client capability from a local secondary storage on the web server.

Referring to *Tracton* Figure 8, *Tracton* discloses a web server 302, clients 304-308, and a central registry 300 that communicate via a network. When a client 304 wants to view a web page, the client 304 sends a client identifier to the web server 302 (step 314). The web server 302 forwards the client identifier to the central registry 300 via the network (step 316). Then, the central registry 300 obtains a client capability from its secondary storage 312 and sends them to the web server 302 (step 318). *Tracton* 8:40-55.

Thus, *Tracton* obtains a client capability from the central registry's 300 secondary storage 312, not the secondary storage of its web server 302. The central registry 300 is a different data processing system than the web server 302, and communicates with the web server 302 via the network. Accordingly, unlike Applicants' claimed invention, *Tracton* does not obtain a client capability from a secondary storage on a web server and not from a second data processing system. For at least this reason, *Tracton* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 11, 21, and 24.

Further, nowhere does *Tracton* disclose or suggest analyzing a request message from a client to obtain a minimum client characteristic. Accordingly, *Tracton* could not disclose or suggest adapting a web page to be compatible with an obtained client capability and a minimum client characteristic, which is detected in a request message from a client. For at least this additional reason, *Tracton* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 11, 21, and 24.

Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 22, and 23 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, or 21 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, and 21 are allowable.

Claims 2, 12, and 25 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 9-11, 19-24 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)

Christopher P. Rauch

SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P. O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

Telephone (312) 876 8000

Customer No. 58,328